

### REMARKS

In the outstanding Office action dated August 25, 2005, claims 1-6, 8, 9, 12-15, 17-19, 21, 24 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Poncet (5,833,694). Moreover, claim 10 was rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poncet. Additionally, claims 1-9, 12-22, 24 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonald et al. (6,090,136) in view of Staehle et al. (6,132,458). Claims 11 and 23 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but were deemed allowable if rewritten in independent form.

It is respectfully submitted, however, that none of the cited prior art references teach the subject matter recited in independent claims 1, 18 and 22. Significantly, none of the cited art, either alone or in combination, teach a system including a first sheath configured to receive a subsequent treatment component after the sheath is placed within vasculature and/or a loading capsule including a superior end that is configured to mate with an inferior end of the first sheath. In rejecting the claims in view of the Poncet reference, the Examiner drew the Applicants attention to Col. 2, lns. 4-15 of that reference. However, that section of the Poncet patent does not teach the combination of the first sheath and the loading capsule recited in the pending claims. Likewise, both the McDonald et al. and the Staehle et al. references are completely lacking in the teaching of the recited first sheath and loading capsule. Furthermore, there is no suggestion in either the McDonald et al. or the Staehle et al. patents to combine their teachings. By lacking the structure recited in the independent claims 1 and 18, the cited references also do not meet the limitations of method claim 22 which require among other things, mating a superior terminal end of a loading capsule with an inferior end of an initial introducer sheath and inserting a subsequent endovascular graft component in the inferior end of the initial


introducer sheath. Therefore, it is submitted that each of the pending claims are in a condition for allowance.

### CONCLUSION

Applicants have attempted to respond to each and every rejection set forth in the outstanding Office Action. In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the application be reconsidered, the claims allowed and the application passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

FULWIDER PATTON LLP

By:   
John V. Hanley  
Registration No. 38,171

JVH/kst  
Howard Hughes Center  
6060 Center Drive, Tenth Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90045  
Telephone: (310) 824-5555  
Facsimile: (310) 824-9696  
Customer No. 24201  
108222.1